

Memorandum

Date: June 28, 2010

To: Central Division

From: **DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**
Sonora Area

File No.: 425.10546.chp11inspection

Subject: 2010 COMMAND INSPECTION OF SONORA AREA COLLISION,
ENFORCEMENT, AND SERVICES – CHAPTER 11

On June 1, 2010, a Command Inspection, per HPM 22.1 Command Inspection Program Manual, Chapter 11, of the Sonora Area Collision, Enforcement, and Services was conducted by an inspection team from Central Division. As a result of the inspection, two items needing corrective action were discovered and documented in the Exceptions Document.

The two items were researched and subsequently corrected by Sonora Area Training Officer, S. Taylor, ID 13869, and Area Administrative Supervisor, Sergeant S. Clamp, ID 12345.

All corrective action has been completed and there are no items of concern regarding the 2010 Sonora Area Command Collisions, Enforcement, and Services Inspection requiring additional follow-up.



M. S. SAMRA, Lieutenant
Commander

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **INSPECTION CHECKLIST**

Chapter 11

Collisions, Enforcement, and Services

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Number: 11
Evaluated by: Lt. D. M. Troxell		Date: June 1, 2010
Assisted by: Sgt. J. Woodley		Date: June 1, 2010

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statutes, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspector's Signature:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Division Level	<input type="checkbox"/> Command Level		
<input type="checkbox"/> Executive Office Level	<input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary Self-Inspection		
Follow-up Required:		Commander's Signature:	Date:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Follow-up Inspection		06/18/2010
<p>Note: A "Yes" response indicates full compliance with policy. If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation.</p> <p>Questions 1 through 3 pertain to Data Collection.</p>			
1. Is the information in Program 10 reports used by the Area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Entire management team uses and relays information contained in the program 10.	
2. Is any additional information used by the Area to prepare scheduling, beat priorities, Special Enforcement Unit (SEU) enforcement, or grant applications?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Predetermined events, Area personnel information, Traffic complaints. Area currently has three working grants.	
3. Do supervisory or management staff convey this data to field officers?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Training days, briefings, staff	
Questions 4 through 9 pertain to Collision Reduction Plans.			
4. Does the Area have a Collision Reduction Plan? Attach to this report.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Strategic Report 2010 and three safety grants	
5. Does the Collision Reduction Plan address specific problems?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Motorcycle, DUI, and speed related collisions.	
6. Are goals and objectives measurable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes	
7. Have collisions been reduced since the inception of the plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.	
8. Did road patrol officers assist in the formulation of the plan(s)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: All personnel	
9. Do supervisors or managers discuss the Collision Reduction Plan in briefing or training days?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Training, briefings, and staff meetings	
Questions 10 through 14 pertain to Deployment and Scheduling.			
10. Are beat priorities set based on collisions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes	
11. Are beat priorities reviewed on a regular basis for accuracy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes	
12. Is the priority schedule consistent with collision and congestion times?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes per AIS statistics	
13. Is the Area beat guide current on beat-specific descriptions and instructions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.	
14. Does the Area have a list of reoccurring special events?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes	

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 11

Collisions, Enforcement, and Services

15. Has overtime been budgeted for these events?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: On Specific beats per grants
16. Are supervisors and managers scheduled based on high activity and special event times?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: MEPs
17. Are motorcycle officers scheduled separately?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks:
18. Are alternate riders available?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks:
Questions 19 through 33 pertain to Enforcement:				
19. Do the officers prepare documents in accordance with HPM 100.9, Enforcement Documents Manual?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
20. Are Area personnel preparing Collision Reports in accordance with HPM 110.5, Collision Investigation Manual?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
21. Are hit and run collisions being adequately investigated?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
22. Do arrest reports contain enough evidence to charge the offenses requested?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
23. Do arrest reports contain the proper headings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
24. Do the officers follow HPM 70.4, DUI Enforcement Manual, in regards to Field Sobriety Testing and Chemical Testing?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
25. Is the Area's Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) regarding Preliminary Alcohol Screening (PAS) devices in compliance with HPM 70.4?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes
26. Does the Area keep accurate and updated forms CHP 202J, Preliminary Alcohol Screening (PAS) Device Out/In Usage Log, in compliance with HPM 70.4?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Each device found to be properly documented using correct form.
27. Is the Area in compliance with HPM 100.4, Radar Speed Enforcement Manual?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Except one officer on loan to Division See exceptions doc.
28. Do the Area's Sobriety Checkpoint Plans conform to HPM 70.4?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes
29. Do the CHP 205, Sobriety/Driver License, Checkpoint Activity Report, forms concur with the checkpoint plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions doc.
30. Is the Area's Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) program in compliance with GO 70.14, Peace Officer Standards and Training, and HPM 70.4?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes
31. Does the Area have SOP regarding call out procedures for DREs?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: No
32. Are the DRE training records up to date, including decertification?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Not updated in the ETRS
33. Does the Area have an SEU?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
Questions 34 through 41 pertain to Services:				
34. Does the Commander emphasize the importance of service as outlined in GO 100.45?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: At all training days, briefings, and staff meetings.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 11

Collisions, Enforcement, and Services

35. Does the Area have SOP for females in need of assistance?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks:
36. Do CHP 415, Daily Field Record, forms reflect services provided to disabled motorists?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes
37. Are CHP 422, Vehicle Check/ Parking Warning/ Highway Damage Report, used in accordance with policy contained in HPM 100.9?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Well documented but occasionally used due to limited freeways in the area.
38. Are vehicles stored; if left on the freeway longer than four hours?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: Yes
39. Are all uniformed employees annually trained in GO 100.6, Special Relationships?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
40. Are collision reports available within eight days? If not, what percentage are available?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.
41. Are the headings in collision reports in compliance with HPM 110.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Remarks: See Exceptions Doc.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 1 of 7

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Chapter: 11
Inspected by: Lt. D. M. Troxell		Date: June 1, 2010

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required.

TYPE OF INSPECTION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Division Level <input type="checkbox"/> Command Level <input type="checkbox"/> Executive Office Level	Total hours expended on the inspection: 40	<input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action Plan Included <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attachments Included
Follow-up Required: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Forward to: Due Date:	
Chapter Inspection #: Chapter 11		
Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:		

The Inspection Team was handed a five page document "CHP SONORA AREA" that thoroughly described the Area's geographical responsibilities, the make-up of personnel, and the goals the personnel work to achieve on a daily basis. The document also included statistical data involving on highway collisions, community inclusion outreach plans, and annual special events. The document is well written and gives the reader an exceptional view of the responsibilities of the entire Sonora CHP Area operations.

Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement:

Inspector's Findings:

The Central Division Inspection North Sector Team conducted an inspection per HPM 22.1 Command Inspections Program Manual, chapter 11, Collisions, Enforcement, and Services. An entrance conference was conducted with the Sonora Commander, Lieutenant Malkiat Samra, and Lead Inspector, Lieutenant D. M. Troxell. The inspection team arrived in the Sonora Area on Monday, June 1, 2010, and completed their work at 1630 hours on the same day. The following inspectors worked the corresponding hours as indicated below:

Inspector	Number of Hours
Lieutenant D. M. Troxell, ID 13163	14
Sergeant J. Woodley, ID 11676	10
Officer Jeremy Key, ID 14781	8
OSS1 Henrietta Koelman	8
Total	40

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Chapter: 11
Inspected by: Lt. D. M. Troxell		Date: June 1, 2010

Page 2 of 7

This inspection was conducted using the methodology contained in chapter 11 of HPM 22.1.

A comparative review was conducted of collision data and the enforcement data from the Management Information System (MIS) and Area Information System (AIS). The data was analyzed in an attempt to identify any abnormal trends or statistics, considering command-specific factors such as weather and traffic patterns, and special enforcement details; whether field officers were conducting appropriate enforcement action in the focus locations determined by the collision statistics; if the enforcement activity was adequate based on the Area's amount of calls for service and the amount of activity for each officer; whether specialized enforcement is taking place; and whether enforcement and collision statistics indicated the enforcement was effective and appropriately directed.

Collisions

A random sample of 20 individual collisions from the review period were selected for assessment, to determine if the reports and investigations were properly formatted and met the minimum requirements as specified in HPM 110.5, Collision Investigation Manual; whether hit and run investigations were sufficiently investigated, and if proper prosecution was sought.

Deployment and Scheduling

The current collision reduction plan in place, Sonora Area Strategic Plan 2010, and all three current Safety Corridor grants were reviewed to ensure they were measurable, complete, flexible, and understandable. Area personnel were interviewed by Inspection Team members discussing the Area's deployment and scheduling needs. The current beat priority was analyzed to evaluate the command's method for determining staff scheduling priorities; impact from vacation scheduling, known special events, and administrative coverage based on the priorities for road patrol; and to determine if the beat descriptions and instructions are current and in compliance with GO 100.64, Beat Descriptions. The Beat guide was examined to determine if current and pertinent information is provided to the officers.

The Area's management, with information provided by field personnel, Accident Investigation Officer, and program 10/AIS information, annually look at beat assignments to ensure adequate and effective coverage is being deployed.

Enforcement:

The enforcement portion of the inspection was based upon information from the prior 12 months preceding this audit. To begin this portion of the inspection, the spreadsheet provided in Annex B was used to conduct a comparative review of the following: the number of crime reports taken, the number of cases cleared by arrest, the number of charges filed by the District Attorney's Office (DA), and the number of convictions to determine if these statistics are appropriate for the Area (not including stolen vehicles or arrests for DUI); specific to Driving Under the Influence (DUI), number of DUI arrests, the number of arrests for which charges have been filed, and the number of convictions to determine if these statistics are appropriate for the Area; and specific to vehicle theft, the number of investigations

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 7

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Chapter: 11
Inspected by: Lt. D. M. Troxell	Date: June 1, 2010	

(reports), the number of recoveries, the number of investigations cleared by arrest, the number of arrests resulting in charges filed by the local District Attorney as a result of arrest, and the number of convictions.

A random sample of 50 of the following forms were selected for review: CHP 215, Notice to Appear; CHP 281, Notice to Correct Violation; and CHP 267, Notice of Parking – Registration Violation, to establish whether enforcement documents are completed in compliance with policy contained in HPM 100.9, Enforcement Documents Manual

A random sampling of 20 arrest reports, not related to DUI or vehicle theft, were reviewed to determine if the elements of the offenses charged were being established and documented properly; whether supervisors are reviewing the reports; and if the officers are following state law and policy (e.g. juvenile notification requirements, citizen arrest procedures, etc.).

A sample of 50 DUI reports was also reviewed as well, including closed cases. The goal was to determine if the proper documentation is included in the report; if personnel were adhering to policy contained in HPM 70.4, Driving Under the Influence Enforcement Manual, in regards to field sobriety tests and chemical testing; and if proper prosecution is being sought.

The Area's Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) regarding Preliminary Alcohol Screening (PAS) devices and the CHP 202J, Preliminary Alcohol Screening Device Out/In Usage Log, was reviewed to determine if local policies were in compliance with HPM 70.4. In addition, SOP was reviewed to determine local procedures relating to the Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) program, including call out procedures.

Services

A random sampling of 20 individual officers' CHP 415, Daily Field Record, forms, were reviewed, to determine if the amount of service rendered is appropriate for the Area. Further, a review of training and SOP regarding special relationships was also conducted.

Findings

#3: Area commander specifically addresses the quarter strategic report results to all personnel during briefings, training days, and staff meetings.

#4-9: From 2007 to the present, the command has placed special emphasis on the number of fatal collisions occurring within the Sonora Area. Management is consistently reiterating to personnel of the goals and objectives within the Department's Strategic Plan. The Area currently has three well written working grants focusing on speed, DUI, and Motorcycle Safety.

#13: The Area beat guide was examined and determined to be current with all pertinent information.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Chapter: 11
Inspected by: Lt. D. M. Troxell		Date: June 1, 2010

Page 4 of 7

#15-17: The Area uses grant overtime for coverage of special events that may adversely affect the Area which can be justified as part of the grant. The Area does not have a motorcycle program.

#19: A random sampling of 50 enforcement documents for calendar year 2009, specifically CHP 215's, CHP 267's, and CHP 281's, revealed many of the officers are not consistently including the insurance policy number on CHP 215's (of the 50 reviewed, 24 were lacking) as required by policy. In addition, several citations did not include the subject's age. A portion (3) of the radar/LIDAR citations reduced the actual speed observed (ex. Issued citation speed of 70+ MPH, and noted a different speed in the description of the violation observed). This may create issues in court testimony, the Inspection Team suggests not including this additional information on any portion of the violator's copy. Also, one citation (#98601LR cited the violator for 12500 (a) VC; however, the violation was made dismissible by the issuing officer. Another issued citation (#97566LR) was a radar citation which did not contain the appropriate radar/patrol unit information. However, in the overall sampling, the various citations were accurate and should be filed by the appropriate District Attorney's Office. *

#20: A random sampling of 20 collisions per year for the 3 proceeding years (2007, 2008, 2009) were reviewed for compliance with HPM 110.5, Collision Investigation Manual. All collisions were well-written, containing minimal omissions/errors (primarily typographical/grammatical), and within departmental policy. One collision (#2007-07-0042), concluded the PCF was mechanical, however, the driver was fully aware of these defects/deficiencies prior to driving the vehicle, which should have resulted in a violation of 22350 VC for the driver. In concluding the review process, it appears the Area Accident Investigation Review Officer and the Area's management team have been thorough in the review process thereby ensuring reports are within departmental policy.

#21: Within the random sampling of collision reports, a representative sample of hit and run collisions were reviewed. All hit and run collisions were adequately investigated, and follow-up investigation was documented on a supplemental report. One hit and run collision (#2008-05-0003) reviewed was an exceptionally well-written report with in-depth follow-up that should have resulted in a successful prosecution. Another hit and run collision (#2009-03-0045) resulted in an in-custody per 40303 (a) VC, which is a misdemeanor that occurred after the collision and was obviously not committed in the officer's presence. A possible option for this specific situation that the arresting officer could have considered was a citizen's arrest by a witness to the original incident. The Area generates a follow-up letter that is signed by the commander and sent to any party that may provide information on the hit and run collision taken by an officer.

#22, 23: A random sampling of 20 felony and misdemeanor arrest reports for calendar year 2009 revealed that all reports contained sufficient evidence to substantiate the offenses requested. The narratives of the arrest reports were typed and provided adequate information supported the offense(s) designated on page #1 of the CHP 216. Area officers are consistently utilizing proper headings and the correct narrative format has been fulfilled. All the reports were reviewed and signed by a supervisor.

24: A random sampling of 50 CHP 202's for calendar year 2009 revealed Area officers are following HPM 70.4 in regards to Field Sobriety Testing and Chemical Testing. Some of the investigations reviewed did not include all of the Standardized Field Sobriety Tests as recommended, but not required,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 5 of 7

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Chapter: 11
Inspected by: Lt. D. M. Troxell	Date: June 1, 2010	

per policy. However, the additional tests provided were authorized by policy. There were minor typographical errors and omissions noted on a minor portion of reports reviewed from the random sampling. One report (#2009-454) reviewed did not include a DS 367. Further, in reviewing the other reports in the sampling, it is likely the Area's overall reports are proper. A comparison of the number of arrests to the number of convictions was not performed. The various County District Attorney's offices within the Sonora's area of responsibilities do not perform this function, due to the time and fiscal constraints required to complete this task. In addition, the Area has not performed this function in past years because of court records access, other than manual search on the county computer. Delegating the function of discovering the disposition of filed cases is an option that the Area may consider in the future, based upon personnel responsibilities. Based on the fact that nearly all cases reviewed were well written with the narratives supporting the charges, it is the opinion of the Inspection Team that overall proper prosecution is being sought on all DUI investigations.

#27: The inspection team reviewed several CHP 215s that radar was used as the primary source of the violation. In reviewing the citations, all were properly documented per HPM 100.4. The Central Division Biennial Audit was completed on November 10, 2008. It was reviewed and found that the Area was in compliance with policy and procedures. Upon request, Area radar training records were provided and showed all personnel were in compliance. The Area's radar coordinator will conduct annual recertification during the fourth quarter training of this year.

#30: The inspection completed a review on one checkpoint event that occurred on August 12, 2009. The Checkpoint Plans were compared to the CHP 205s, Sobriety/Driver License Checkpoint Activity Reports. Sobriety checkpoint operational plans and after-action reviews were reviewed, to establish whether the plans were in compliance with HPM 70.4. Division approval documentation, justification for location, alternate location selection, proper signage placement, press releases on file, and CHP 205, Sobriety/Driver License Checkpoint Activity Report, forms were also reviewed for compliance. All information was accurate and conformed to policy per HPM 70.4.

* #31: The Area's SOP was reviewed to determine local procedures relating to the Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) program, including call out procedures. The Area does not have the DRE program and call-out procedures documented in their SOP.

#32: The Area has seven (7) current DRE Officers. Their training records were not up-to-date in the electronic training records system (ETRS). The Academy DRE unit was contacted and confirmed all current DRE Officers are in good standings. Further, the Area has no recently de-certified DRE's.

#33: The Area does not have a Special Enforcement Unit (SEU), but has put together an enforcement unit when certain problems occur within their community. The Sonora Area also has a Special Investigation Team (SIT) that utilizes the expertise of individual officers on cases requiring in-depth investigating.

* #39: The Area's training officer informed the inspection team that two of Sonora's personnel were not trained in G.O. 100.6, Special Relationships. The two personnel will receive immediate training to

**COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Page 6 of 7

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Chapter: 11
Inspected by: Lt. D. M. Troxell		Date: June 1, 2010

ensure the Area is in compliance. The commander emphasizes the importance of Special Relationships during all Area Training days, Staff Meetings, and briefings.

#40: The Area reported a 91% average for compliance in having reports available to the public within an eight-day time frame in 2009. It should be noted that the Area in 2010 continues their high rate of success for compliance of MM 08-050; Strategic Plan Goal 1.2.

#41: A random sampling of 20 collisions for the 3 proceeding years was reviewed for compliance with HPM 110.5, Collision Investigation Manual. The collisions used the appropriate headings as recommended in HPM 110.5.

FINDINGS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP:

#31: Policy contained in chapter 11 of HPM 70.4 requires commands to establish SOP of call out procedures for DREs. The command has no SOP specific to DREs. The Training Sergeant informed the Inspection Team that they will be adding a DRE call-out procedure in the near future.

#39: The Area's training officer informed the inspection team that two of Sonora's personnel were not trained in G.O. 100.6, Special Relationships. **The two individuals will immediately review GO 100.6 upon their return to the Area. Once completed, the Area will update records to indicate compliance.**

Commander's Response: ☐ Concur or ☐ Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 7 of 7

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Chapter: 11
Inspected by: Lt. D. M. Troxell		Date: June 1, 2010

Required Action:
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline

<input type="checkbox"/> Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE <i>[Signature]</i>	DATE 06/18/2010
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE <i>[Signature]</i>	DATE 6/11/2010
<input type="checkbox"/> Reviewer discussed this report with employee <input type="checkbox"/> Concur <input type="checkbox"/> Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 0

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
 Chapter 11
 Collisions, Enforcement, and Services

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Area No.: 425
Evaluated By: Lt. D. M. Troxell		Date: 6/01/10
Assisted By: OSS1 H. Koelman		

Utilize the 'Comments' section to provide details regarding changes in totals or any other significant details.

Month	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Totals	Percentages		
														Total Investigations	Arrests	Filed
Number of Investigations (excluding DUI and 10851)	8	9	5	8	10	14	6	4	7	9	1	8	89			
Number cleared by arrest	7	8	4	7	9	12	5	4	3	8	1	7	75	84%		
Number filed by district attorney (D.A.)																
Number of convictions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	NA	NA	100%
Number of DUI arrests	26	24	35	42	37	30	28	24	29	23	22	30	350			
Number filed by district attorney (D.A.)																
Number of convictions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	100%	
Number of vehicles stolen	7	8	10	4	8	7	11	7	3	12	8	4	89			
Number of vehicles recovered	4	10	12	3	4	3	4	5	5	4	6	2	62	70%		
Number cleared by arrest	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	10%		
Number filed by district attorney (D.A.)														NA	NA	
Number of convictions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	NA	NA

Comments: The Sonora-Area files their court cases in three different counties. None of the three counties provide information back to the Area relating to the actual filing of the case or the disposition. The court officer did call and request filing and conviction information while the Inspection Team was present. The court officer was informed that the court does not have the personnel presently to handle the requested task.

* Stolen vehicle information was obtained by the Areas's CHP 136e(s)